



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative for an interview. Upon review of the appeal brief filed 09/08/2009 the examiner noticed a difference in interpretation of the claims and the prior art definitions. The examiner contacted applicant with a suggestion to amend the claims to incorporate the input matrix of figure 5 and 6. Clearly the inventive concept, as shown in the drawings, was the input into the graphical display within a cell that then indicated an input to a state machine. The particular input at cell x.y contains both a state and status of the process plant and also indicates the next state to transition to. The prior art did not suggest or disclose in combination the features of independent claims as a whole. The examiner suggested rolling the subject matter of claim 4 or 5 into claim 1 to capture the user interaction with the matrix to configure the inputs to the state machine function block in a process plant. Applicant agreed on 12/04/2009 and the claims as amended are allowed. .